



City of Carmel

Carmel Advisory Board of Zoning Appeals Regular Meeting Monday, February 28, 2005

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Carmel Board of Zoning Appeals met at 7:00 PM on Monday, February 28, 2005, in the Council Chambers of City Hall, Carmel, Indiana. The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Members in attendance were Kent Broach, Leo Dierckman, James Hawkins, Earlene Plavchak and Madeleine Torres, thereby establishing a quorum. Jon Dobosiewicz, Angie Conn and Mike Hollibaugh represented the Department of Community Services. John Molitor, Legal Counsel, was also present.

Mr. Dierckman moved to approve the minutes of the January 24, 2005 meeting as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Torres and **APPROVED 5-0.**

G. Reports, Announcements, Legal Counsel Report and Department Concerns

Mr. Molitor gave the Legal Report. He has been watching two bills in the Indiana General Assembly. House Bill 1300 would prohibit the Board from requiring that non-conforming signs be removed when it approves any new variance or special use. He will discuss it with staff. The other bill would create a Smart Growth Study Commission to be staffed by a new Economic Development Corporation created by the Daniels' administration. It could propose some interesting legislation, perhaps using Carmel as a model for the rest of the State.

1g. Proposed Amendments to Rules of Procedure-Changes regarding meeting time and agenda order to be considered.

In order to follow suit with the City Council adopting a rule change to start their meeting at 6:00 PM, the Department would like the Board to contemplate a change of their meeting time to 6:00 PM. The rule takes a majority approval.

Mr. Dierckman moved to approve the change in Article III, Section 1, to 6:00 PM from 7:00 PM, effective with the March meeting. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Plavchak and **APPROVED 5-0.** The Department will adjust the signs that are posted.

Mrs. Conn requested that the Board suspend the rules in order to hear Item 6-8h. They had published the wrong date, February 18 instead of February 28, in their notice and re-published on Friday, February 25 with the correct date.

Mr. Dierckman moved to suspend the rules in order to hear Item 6-8h. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Torres and **APPROVED 5-0.**

H. Public Hearing.

The following Item, moved from the 6:30 PM Hearing Officer agenda, was heard at this time.

2d. Carmel/Clay Schools, Soccer Fields at River Rd

The applicant seeks special use approval to construct sports fields and parking:

Docket No. 05010046 SU Chapter 5.02 Special Use in S-1 Zone

Docket No. 05020006 V Chapter 27.03.0 parking lot curbing

The site is located at the northwest corner of River Rd and 126th Street. The site is zoned S-1/Residence-Low Density and is within the Special Flood Hazard Zone.

Filed by George Zboyovsky of Paul I Cripe for Carmel/Clay Schools.

Present for the Petitioner: George Zboyovsky of Paul I. Cripe, Senior Project Manager for the project. The Special Use is for soccer fields, parking, and restroom and storage facilities at the site. Most of the property is located with the 100-year flood plain which limits its use and value and is ideal for sporting and recreation facilities. The Variance from the curbing requirements is because it is located in a flood plain. There have been concerns in the past. There will be no lighting at any time. He had distributed a wetland delineation report to Jon Dobosiewicz and Scott Brewer. It indicated, probably because of the vestal ditch running through the property, that the wetland is free and clear based upon the investigation. The benefits from the project in addition to providing a much needed soccer field, will be drainage under the fields that will help alleviate some of the flooding problems. Drainage from the two parking lots will be routed to two dry detention basins to provide detention as well as water quality by running the water through the dedicated detention basins. They had met with the local community to present the project and listen to their concerns. One of the biggest concerns at that meeting was the parking and the number of parking spaces, as well as location. At one time, the southern parking lot of approximately 250 parking spaces was located in the south western corner. As a result of the meeting, the southern parking area was relocated to a more centralized location, over 100 yards from the western and southern parking boundaries. They will allow for an additional reserved area should the need occur. The northern lot initially had over 300 parking spaces. That is been reduced to under 200 spaces. They were requesting a waiver to postpone the construction of the pathways until the northern fields were constructed in a year.

Mr. Hawkins outlined the general parameters of the meeting. The Petitioner's presentation will be followed by the general public comments that are favorable for five minutes. Organized or unfavorable remonstrance will be fifteen minutes. If there are general public comments that are unfavorable, they try to keep to five minutes. They want to hear from everyone, but do not want repetition. The Petitioner's rebuttal will follow the public comments.

Favorable public comments: None.

Organized Remonstrance:

Mary J. Kienholz, 12951 MacAlister Trace, across from the proposed fields. She had submitted a letter earlier and now had neighbors' signatures on the letter. She had attended the meeting at the school. Her main concern was the daily use of the road for six months. River Road, in her opinion, is not wide enough for traffic. The School Board letter said school use. However, at the meeting the Dad's Club came with their usage. It will be about three months in the spring and three months in the fall. It will be every evening from 5:00 PM until dusk, all day Saturdays and some Sunday usage. On River Road it was amended from 300 to 195 parking spaces for one soccer field, with the ditch supposedly off-limits

according to the DNR. The parking lot at 126th Street is 180 spaces amended from 200 spaces for six soccer fields. That did not seem proportionally right. Her neighbors who signed the letter were not concerned about school usage it is the excessive use by the Dad's Club. There is the existing River Road Park with acres of fields and why was that not considered.

Ken Eaton, 13039 Double Eagle Drive, Vice President of the Plum Creek Ridge Homeowners Association. It was difficult to say he was against this program although it abuts the houses in his neighborhood. Since nothing is buildable, the soccer fields may be the best use. He had a number of issues to present. One issue is the removal of approximately 150 trees. He had heard that each tree uses approximately 50 gallons of water per day. When the trees are removed, the water level will raise. The homes on Lochmere already have problems with ground water and basement flooding. He recognizes that there may not be wetlands and there will be tile to drain the surface water from the fields. But the removal of the trees will raise the water level and cause problems. The second issue was that neither his subdivision nor the Carmel School administration was in favor of the hammerhead that the Planning Department has required. That will be at the end of Lochmere for the possible turning around of emergency vehicles. He wanted to point out that if it is there parents will be encouraged to park there and on Lochmere, blocking regular traffic. Another issue was reducing the parking on River Road that would cause the parents to park along River Road. He felt if the project was approved, there must be more on-sight parking. He had figured that there would be approximately 216 cars for the first game slot at the six fields. If there were only 180 parking spaces as originally planned, that would leave them very short. Then the parents would be arriving for the second game slot on the six fields before the first game was over. That would be an over abundance of cars for the planned parking spaces. His last issue was about the part of the project along River Road that would be developed in 2006. That would help with the parking, but there will be no access to the other fields because there will not be a bridge over the vestal creek. Therefore, the people will have to walk down River Road and into the southern end of the project. He had been told that the south end of the area might be used for a school some time in the future. He felt extra parking could be installed on this area and it would be easy to tear up in the future for a building. He would like to see parking on the south end with an ingress and egress from River Road and that would ease off the ingress and egress directly across from Medalist Parkway.

Tom Gjerde, 5406 Zoeller Circle, Plum Creek Ridge. There are eight properties on his cul-de-sac and all have had water in their basement at some time or other. The builders, Trinity and Ryland, encountered ground water. They raised some of the homes such as his approximately four feet. Even with that, they still have ground water. He felt there needed to be further ground water studies before the trees are removed and find out what the effects will be. The tile under the soccer fields will help alleviate surface water flowing into the ground. But the removal of thousands of trees will affect the absorption of thousands of gallons of water per week that will not be absorbed out of the ground. He had contacted two ground water experts at Indiana University. Both of them came to the conclusion that given the trade-offs between the tile under the soccer fields and the removal of trees, there should be further studies. He gave copies of their emails to the Board.

Dick Stein, Medalist Parkway, Plum Creek Village which is immediately south of the proposed project. Medalist Parkway is the only street that runs through Plum Creek Village connecting 126th and 122nd Streets and runs into the open end of the new project. There are already soccer fields at 126th Street and River Road and more at Badger Park on 131st Street. He felt the new fields should be on the west side of Carmel instead of the extreme east side. All of the traffic will be coming from the west because Fishers is the only thing on the east. There are only two thoroughfares that go all the way

through from the west side to the east side. That is 116th Street and 146th Street. The Homeowners Association formed a committee to find out about this proposal and to compile the objections of the owners. Traffic is their main concern. They have always had lots of cut-through traffic on Medalist Parkway. They have worked with the City and had street humps installed which have helped but have not solved the problem. The other concern was the quality of life for their village and future property values. Most of the village is empty nesters. They would like commitments for the hours of operation and lighting, screening of the property/landscaping, litter control, and protection of the property from use by others after hours.

Jeff Melin, 12667 Plum Creek Drive in Plum Creek Farms. He is a bird watcher that looks out the back of his house at these woods. This is probably one of the last and best remaining wild life refuges on the east side of Carmel. There is enough existing area that is clear to slide the group of six fields down to 126th Street and rotate the south parking lot 90 degrees to the right to align it with River Road and to expand more parking in the northern corner. Then the wooded area would not have to be destroyed to accommodate this project.

Mark Wagner, 5403 Baltimore Court. He is not opposed to soccer fields in this flood plain area, but it needs to be done right. His chief problem was the location of parking. He would like to see it moved further south and away from the homes. People paid more to live next to the woods and on a cul-de-sac. He felt the property values would be lowered by soccer fields and parking right behind the houses. The school wanted to keep the open area clear for a possible future elementary school. He felt the project should be done right for this time, not worry about the future at this point. All the other newer elementary schools currently have parking on each side and that could happen in this area.

O. J. Stocker, 5942 McKinges Circle, Prairie View Chapman's Place. Presently at River Road Park there are approximately 170 parking spaces for a couple of rugby fields. Whenever there is a rugby match, the cars spill over onto River Road, making it very unsafe on Saturdays. This project seems to be too many fields for the parking. He felt the number of fields should be reduced to four and hours of operation should be limited.

David Johnson, 5947 Chapmans Trail. He felt the excess cars would fill all the adjoining Streets. Badger Field, with ten fields and approximately 320 parking spaces, overflows into the Administrative Building parking. He felt they should try a reciprocal agreement with the County Park or the new Central Park for space for soccer fields. He also felt that after hours should be monitored because of kids hanging out and vehicular traffic.

Skip Keen, 5399 Baltimore Court, Plum Creek Ridge, which is a cul-de-sac that backs up to the parking lot. He is also a Dad's Club coach for seven years and is familiar with the game 1 to game 2 overlap. He coaches at Towne Meadow and there are too many fields. There are ten baseball fields, 2 soccer fields and two football fields. The neighborhood behind the area becomes a parking lot. There are also cars parked along Towne Road. He would like to see this project limited to three fields and then it would not be necessary to cut down any more mature trees.

Mary J. Kienholz, 12951 MacAlister Trace. The DNR verified that no structure should be built across the vestal creek. Therefore, people parking in the north section would not be able to get to the fields in the southern section.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Zboyovsky thanked everyone for their comments. It is correct that there will be no bridge over the vestal ditch. However, the County has required them to dredge and clean the ditch as part of the project. He felt that would further aid the flood plain situation. Regarding the parking, it would be hard to please everyone. The parking criteria were primarily based on the City Codes and Ordinances. The six southern fields are primarily to be used only for practice for students 14, 15, and 16 years old. They will be dropped off after school by the school transportation and then will need to be picked up by parents at the end of the practice. There are a number of trees in the landscaping plan along the border and parking areas. He was not qualified to know how that would affect the water table. The fields will be grass and irrigated as opposed to the old corn fields in the agricultural area. For security, they will possibly be adding a fence along the western property lines with gates and added police patrols in the area. They had tried to centralize the parking lot as much as possible to keep it away from everyone and the roadways. It is primarily for younger children to play soccer.

Naser Al-Rafie, Paul I. Cripe. Concerning the security, they had tried to keep the parking away from the houses and they are committed to putting in gates. There will acceleration and deceleration lanes. They would be landscaping with trees along the west side. The open area in the southeastern corner is the only area in the parcel that is above flood plain. That is why the school wants to keep it for future use. The number of practice fields is for the school needs for elementary and middle schools. They will not be cutting down all the trees. The entry points on the east side of River Road were required by City Planning to line up with existing exit points from the subdivision on River Road and the Plum Creek subdivision. They could shift the entry points, but they were trying to adhere to the City requirements.

Mrs. Conn gave the Department Report. According to the Carmel/Clay Comprehensive Plan, low density residential areas should be served by and be accessible to schools, parks, playgrounds, sports fields and things of that sort. This use complements the neighborhood area. The developer is willing to provide accessibility to the site with the required ten-foot asphalt paths along both roads. The developer is also committed to provide street right-of-way if the streets ever need to be widened. The Department recommends that the Board approve this item after all concerns have been addressed.

Mr. Dierckman stated that he felt the Dad's Club adds to the complexity of this project because it brings in a lot of mass and utilization. Their involvement with this property needs to be studied. He felt it was appropriate to continue this matter. He suggested the Petitioner meet with the all the concerned people and try to work something out that was fair and reasonable to the school corporation, as well as the concerned neighbors.

Mrs. Torres agreed with Mr. Dierckman on continuing the issue. She felt strongly on clarifying who will be using the fields. The neighbors stated the Carmel Dad's Club and the Petitioner stated the schools. She knows from experience about the traffic and parking situations.

Mr. Broach wanted to know the location of the trees. He felt it would be important to look at alternate designs with fewer fields. His two children play Carmel Dad's Club soccer at Shelborne and Badger and he knows about the traffic. He had not heard compelling evidence for that many fields. He was also concerned about the tree removal, the buffer and ground water issues. The neighbors had done a good job of highlighting the issues. He felt the Petitioner and neighbors should meet to sort things out.

Mrs. Plavchak stated that the site plan showed that the property was owned by the Carmel/Clay School Corporation and the Carmel Dad's Club.

Mr. Zboyovsky stated that the Carmel/Clay School Corporation currently owns the entire parcel. There will be an agreement for the Carmel Dad's Club to utilize the northern area.

Mr. Hawkins stated that he had the same general concerns. He asked Mr. Molitor for the Petitioner's options.

Mr. Dierckman stated that it may take more than one month to straighten this out.

Mr. Molitor stated that the Board has general discretion to continue the hearing upon a motion by any Board member. It seemed to him that the Board members had given the Petitioner good guidance to what the concerns were. It could take additional meetings between the Petitioner and the Remonstrators. The issues revolve around the intensity of the uses and the traffic.

Mr. Zboyovsky stated that they would not be opposed to tabling the dockets.

Mr. Molitor stated essentially there was an agreement that it needed to be done. So there was not a difference between continuing or tabling the dockets, since it was not because of any lack of preparation by the Petitioner:

Mr. Dierckman moved to continue **Carmel/Clay Schools, Soccer Fields at River Rd, Docket Nos. 05010046 SU and 05020006 V**. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Torres and **APPROVED 5-0**.

1h. CMC Properties, Sec 2, lot 3

Petitioner seeks the following development standards variance approval:

Docket No. 04120010 V Chapter 25.07.03.03(d)(2) real estate sign height

The site is located at the northwest corner of 131st St. and US 31. The site is zoned B-5/Business within the US 31 Overlay.

Filed by Sherry Marchbanks of Mazda Sign, Inc. for CMC.

Present for the Petitioner: Sherry Marchbanks, Mazda Signs, 12429 N. Meridian, Carmel. The Zoning Ordinance states that a real estate signs can only be five feet above grade for a 5-acre property. She showed pictures of the property with the grade eight feet below the road. Therefore, a sign at eight feet would not be seen. CMC moved into Carmel with the intent of leasing building space to small businesses that would grow into larger businesses. Currently they have 42,000 square feet and are planning to build two more buildings according to their PUD, for a total of approximately 130,000 square feet. They currently lease to dozens of businesses. This leasing sign is seen by everyone going through the area. Most leasing signs are at grade. As you travel north on U.S. 31 the current 19-foot sign is just barely showing above the eight-foot grade. At grade it would not be visible. The Duke leasing sign across the street is not visible from U. S. 31 because it is at eight feet. CMC needs their sign to show because their business is leasing space in this building. They are not asking that the sign remain at nineteen feet. They are willing to cover the sign with alum-i-core (a sample was shown). It is not injurious to any residential area. The other signs on the property will come down. A lot of the clients are temporary offices or small offices looking for space to lease.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor or opposition to the petition: no one appeared.

The Public Hearing was closed.

Mrs. Conn gave the Department Report. The building does not have its permanent sign. Once that is up, they will be visible. The Department would never approve of a permanent sign that was that tall. The Department is recommending negative consideration of the docket.

Mr. Dierckman asked about the temporary banner.

Mrs. Marchbanks stated that the permit for the temporary sign had expired.

Mr. Dierckman felt they needed a variance for a banner sign in the middle of the building until the permanent sign is up. The current sign is an eyesore. Even masking it with white alum-i-core, it was still too tall. There needs to be some alternative, so that they could have a leasing sign.

Mrs. Plavchak agreed that the sign was an eyesore. She asked about the permanent sign.

Mrs. Marchbanks stated that they are in fabrication. But even when the sign is up, it will not say that it has space for lease. It will just say CMC Offices. It does not say anything about leasing. There will be additional space for lease when the additional buildings are built.

Mrs. Torres felt the sign was very visible. She asked about its distance above the road.

Mrs. Marchbanks stated that the bottom of the sign was eight feet above the road. They understand that 19 feet is not acceptable, but they still need some sign to say that they are leasing space in the building.

Mrs. Torres felt that people could see the permanent CMC sign on the building and look up information online about leasing.

Jim Cohen, CMC Properties, 10925 Reed Hartman Highway, Cincinnati, Ohio. A huge percentage of their inquiries come from drive-by cell phone calls. They know that the sign is an eyesore. It was intended to be temporary and they will redesign the sign. The purpose of the variance is for this unique situation. The grade of the property drops off eight feet immediately, so that they are in a hole. When they applied for their rezone, the neighbors were very supportive of their business because they provide a nice product. They provide space for businesses that need 2000 square feet or less. They are more than half filled. Without that sign they would be out of business because anyone seeing CMC Properties would not know what kind of business they do. They need a lease office sign describing small office space for lease with a phone number. All their other buildings in Indiana, Kentucky and Ohio have this type signage. They will re-design the sign to come up with something that is acceptable. The problem with a banner is that Carmel does not allow long-term banners and a banner is parallel to the road and not as visible a perpendicular sign.

Mr. Dierckman asked about how many two-sided signs were permitted.

Mrs. Conn said that they were permitted a two-sided leasing sign with a sixty degree separation.

Discussion followed regarding putting a sign on each end of the building, the grade of the property, the size, height and visibility of the current sign, the permanent sign, and the design and size of a new leasing sign.

Mrs. Conn suggested the Board might want to table this item so that the Petitioner could come back with a more appealing design.

Mr. Cohen stated that they had been tabled last month because their Public Notice had not been published and they would like to get this issue resolved regarding the variance for the height. They were willing to work closely with staff to resolve the issues.

Mr. Hawkins stated it was not the Board's function to help with the design of the sign, but approving the variance. The quality of the current sign is affecting the decision.

Mr. Dierckman stated that if the current temporary sign was still up, they were not losing business. They need to come back with a better sign design.

Mr. Molitor stated that the Board does have the ability to weigh in on the aesthetic value of the sign as well as the height. Anything that could affect property value is relevant to the Board's consideration. The Board does not regulate the text of the sign. He suggested that the Petition could be sent to the Hearing Officer between now and the next regular Board meeting in March.

Mr. Dierckman moved to table **Docket No. 04120010 V, CMC Properties, Sec 2, lot 3** to the next Hearing Officer meeting. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Plavchak and **APPROVED 5-0.**

2-5h. Tom Wood Nissan

The applicant seeks the following development standards variance approvals:

Docket No. 05010026 V Chapter 26.04.05 buffer yard requirements

Docket No. 05010027 V Chapter 25.07.02-08.b total number of signs

Docket No. 05010028 V Chapter 25.07.02-08.b 5 signs oriented south

Docket No. 05010029 V Chapter 14.04.09.03 maximum lot coverage

The site is located at 4150 E 96th Street and is zoned B-3/Business.

Filed by Larry Lawhead of Barnes & Thornburg for Tom Wood Nissan.

Present for the Petitioner: Larry Lawhead, 11 S. Meridian, Indianapolis. This property is surrounded by commercial usage. The project has received approval from the Plan Commission for the DP/ADLS. There would be four wall signs facing 96th Street. There is also one ground sign at the corner of Bauer Drive and 96th Street. The Ordinance would allow two large signs a little over 200 square feet, one along 96th Street and one facing East Bauer Drive. The Ordinance allows the movement of the Bauer Drive sign to face 96th Street. The total square footage of the signs requested in the variances is just a little over one-half of total square footage that would be allowed with the two large signs. One sign is the service area and is about 8.75 square feet. In the past, Mr. Woods has used a service sign for his dealerships that was three square feet. That sign did not need a variance. However, Mr. Woods has had a number of complaints from customers, because they could not easily see the sign. Therefore, it was expanded to 8.75 square feet. The other three signs are the Nissan logo, dealer identification, and franchise identification. The Nissan logo sign is 29.2 square feet, the Nissan ball or word mark is 27.3 square feet and the dealer sign is 17.5 square feet. The monument sign at the corner is six feet high by five feet seven inches. They could have put the logo, franchise and dealer information into one huge sign, but they did not feel that was attractive or efficient. The next variance is for the bufferyard. The east bufferyard next to SBC is a required ten-foot buffer area. They would like to reduce that to five feet. During the Plan Commission process they expanded the west bufferyard to fifteen feet. Along the

east property line is a drainage swale, which is a green area about twenty to thirty feet. This is a narrow lot and aesthetically this is an efficient way to place the building on the parcel. They have been in contact with the Urban Forester for the landscaping and are maintaining the same number and level of plantings required. The other buffer issue is along 96th Street. They would like to reduce it from the 25-foot requirement to 15 feet for a number of reasons. In 1995 when 96th Street was expanded by the County, Mr. Wood donated a substantial amount of frontage along 96th Street to help the project. Therefore, they did not feel he should be penalized in developing this site. The final variance is for the maximum coverage of the lot, which is 80 percent coverage. By giving up the frontage along 96th Street, it is shoved back on this very narrow lot. There are also some drainage issues. A retention pond would help but they did not feel it was safe. Instead they have proposed and it has been approved by the Plan Commission to have underground detention in the front. There are big barrels buried in the ground to handle the water from this area.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor or opposition to the petition: no one appeared.

The Public Hearing was closed.

Mrs. Conn gave the Department Report. The Petitioner has worked with the Plan Commission and addressed all issues with design, architecture and signage. The Department recommends favorable consideration of all docket numbers.

Mrs. Plavchak felt the monument sign was very elegant. However, she did not see the need to repeat the same logo above the door. She felt it was cluttered looking.

Mr. Lawhead showed examples of other signs along 96th Street and they were trying to be consistent. They are reducing what is allowed and do not feel it is cluttered but more visually and aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Dierckman asked if the entire monument sign was lit. He would prefer just the Nissan be lit and not the entire box surrounding it.

Mr. Lawhead was not sure.

Mr. Dobosiewicz stated that only the Nissan logo was lit and not the entire sign.

Mr. Broach asked about the signage on the building.

Mr. Lawhead stated that they were all identified as being internally illuminated.

Mr. Dierckman stated that the packet indicated that the monument sign was illuminated. He felt the colors should not be bright like some of the others along 96th Street.

Mrs. Conn stated each sign along 96th Street was how it was presented and approved by the Plan Commission.

Mr. Dierckman moved to approve **Docket Nos. 05010026 V, 05010027 V, 05010028 V and 05010029 V, Tom Wood Nissan**, with the **Condition** that the Petitioner provides the recorded copy of the

dedication of the additional right-of-way. The motion was seconded by Mr. Broach and all were **APPROVED 5-0.**

6-8h. Carmel/Clay Schools, New K-5 Elementary School No. 11

The applicant seeks to construct a school east of the existing Creekside Middle School. The applicant seeks the following special use and development standards variance approvals:

Docket No. 05010037 SU	Chapter 5.02	Special use
Docket No. 05010039 V	Chapter 25.07.01-2	Institutional ground sign height
Docket No. 05010040 V	Chapter 25.07.02-05.d	Traffic directional sign area

The site is located at the southeast corner of Shelborne Road and 126th Street and is zoned S-1/Residence-Low Density. Filed by William E. Payne, AIA of Fanning/Howey Associates, Inc. for Carmel/Clay Schools.

Present for the Petitioner: Allen Cradler, Fanning/Howey Associates. With the continued growth in the Carmel area, the Carmel/Clay Schools require an additional elementary school for the west side of town. The new school will be on the Shelborne Road campus with Creekside Middle School and College Wood Elementary School. The new elementary will basically be the same as the elementary schools that were previously built. It matches College Wood, Towne Meadow and Prairie Trace Schools. It will be located along the east side of the internal drive. It will have its own parking area, bus drop off area, and playground similar to the other elementary schools. The internal drive connects all the various facilities and connects it to Shelborne Road and 126th Street. All utilities are available on the site as they were brought to serve the other facilities. Also included on the site on the lower southeast side is an additional outdoor classroom area that was already started as part of the previous project with outdoor classroom pavilion, additional walks and walkways and a pedestrian bridge over the creek/ditch.

Ron Farrand, Carmel/Clay Schools. He handed out a paper regarding the outdoor structure the science teachers would like near the pond. It would be like the outdoor facilities at Clay Middle School.

Mr. Cradler stated that the exterior of the new school would basically be the same as the others. The brick colors may be reversed from College Wood to give its own identity. Some items from the TAC meeting that have already been addressed are additional striping along 126th Street to better direct people and additional walks along the internal drive to help interconnect the buildings for pedestrians. They will be meeting with the County Surveyor to review the ditch as it goes through the property to see if there are other improvements for drainage. The two variances are for the signage; the building identification sign and two directional signs on either side of the entry drive. Both are consistent with the identification signs for Creekside and for College Wood that were previously approved. The directional signs are also consistent with the directional signs that are used throughout the site.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor of the petition: no one appeared.

Remonstrance:

David [inaudible], 3548 W. 126th Street, north of Creekside Middle School. For some reason, once the schools were developed, from the traffic moving to the west up to Shelborne quite a number of vehicles pull into his drive and seem confused about where they are going. His office window faces out to the road, so he has occasion to notice the traffic. Somehow they are confused about the entry to the

school. They turn around and go back to College Wood as if they had missed the drive. It is at least seven to ten cars per day. It seems insignificant, although he was concerned about the traffic pattern. Also, with three soccer fields and the bus facility that has been approved but not been constructed at this time, he did not know how these and the new elementary school would impact the traffic in the area. He felt the issue of directional signs should be addressed so that people will know where they are going. Also the speed limit of 25 is not being observed, even by the parents.

The Public Hearing was closed.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Farrand stated there are no directional signs at any of the entrances, so with a third school they will need to study the problem. The nine soccer fields are being reduced to three with the other six moving to the 126th and River Road facility that was discussed earlier.

Mr. Dobosiewicz gave the Department Report. It made sense to the Department that there would be some kind of signage for directions and to identify the campus and all three buildings. He felt the people were not familiar with the site and how it interconnected. They would be willing to work with the School Corporation to come up with an appropriate proposal. The Department recommended favorable consideration of the three dockets tonight.

Mrs. Torres asked about the parking design at the school and if the parking was the same as Towne Meadow, because Towne Meadow does not have enough.

Mr. Farrand stated that this was less parking than Towne Meadow, but this school has other buildings nearby with parking that can be used for overflow.

Mr. Dierckman asked if the Petitioner would commit to coming back for additional signage.

Mr. Farrand stated that the signage would not be standard in size with others in the school corporation. He wanted to know if it could be included in this approval so that they would not have to come back.

Mr. Dierckman stated they would have to come back but it could be with a Hearing Officer.

Mr. Dobosiewicz stated that the shelter building could be added to the motion for the Special Use.

Mr. Dierckman moved to approve **Docket Nos. 05010037 SU in addition to the shelter building, 05010039 V and 05010040 V, Carmel/Clay Schools, New K-5 Elementary School No. 11, Contingent** upon the commitment to work with Staff for directional signage. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Torres and all three Dockets were **APPROVED 5-0**.

9-13h. TABLED ~~Companion Animal Hospital~~

~~Applicant seeks use variance & development standards variance approvals for veterinary hospital.~~

~~Docket No. 04090009 UV Chapter 19.01 permitted uses~~

~~Docket No. 04090010 V Chapter 27.05 number of parking spaces~~

~~Docket No. 04090023 V Chapter 26.04.05 buffer yard requirements~~

~~Docket No. 04090024 V Chapter 1904.03 side yard setbacks WITHDRAWN~~

~~Docket No. 04090025 V Chapter 19.04.02 front yard setback~~
~~The site is located at 1425 S Range Line Rd and is zoned B 8/Business.~~
~~Filed by Jim Shinaver of Nelson & Frankenberger for Dr. Buzzetti.~~

14-16h. TABLED ~~O'Malia Fireplace Shop Expansion~~

~~The applicant seeks the following development standards variances:~~

~~Docket No. 04100017 V Chapter 12.04.02 front yard setback~~

~~Docket No. 04100018 V Chapter 27.03.02 no curbed parking~~

~~Docket No. 04110009 V Chapter 26.04.05 buffer yard requirements~~

~~The site is located at 220 S Range Line Rd. The site is zoned B 1/Business.~~

~~Filed by Paul Reis of Drewry Simmons Pitts & Vornehm for the Helen J. O'Malia Trust~~

I. Old Business.

There was no Old Business.

J. New Business.

There was no New Business.

K. Adjourn.

Mrs. Plavchak moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dierckman and **APPROVED 5-0.**
The meeting adjourned at 9:25 PM.

James R. Hawkins, President

Connie Tingley, Secretary